



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,291	09/16/2003	Chaitanya Dev Sarcen	60001.0272US01/MS 301788.	2618
7590	10/03/2006		EXAMINER	
Leonard J. Hope Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903				LONG, ANDREA NATAE
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/663,291	SAREEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Andrea N. Long	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2003 and 19 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/16/2003</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 16 and 26 recite the limitation "computer readable medium". In the specification the applicant discloses that a computer program product is equivalent to a computer readable medium. In addition the specification states, "the computer program product may also be a propagated signal on a carrier readable by a computing system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process".

As such, electromagnetic signals are not considered to be statutory subject matter since it is not either process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter {see the "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" Annex IV(c)}.

As to claim 27, the application claims an *apparatus capable of displaying the user interface*. The mere displaying of information is non-statutory. Claimed subject matter must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1- 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tom Syroid et al. (*Outlook 2000 In a Nutshell: A Power User's Quick Reference*, published May 2000, pages 15 and 244-252) Herein after "Syroid".

As to claim 1, Syroid discloses the *method for providing a user interface for defining an electronic message handling rule* (p. 245 [003], p. 246 Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses rules for automated message handling in an email system), *the method comprising, receiving a request to create an electronic message handling rule* (p. 246 [004] [006] → Syroid discloses by selecting the Tools option to execute the Rules Wizard to create, modify or delete a rule); *in response to the request, identifying a context in which the request to create the electronic message handling rule was received* (p. 246 [004], Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses a description is provided to give details on what the rule does); *and providing a user interface for defining the electronic message handling rule, wherein the contents of the user interface are customized based on the identified context* (p. 246 Fig 6-14 → Syroid displays a user interface which provides detailed rules).

As to claim 2, Syroid teaches wherein *the customized user interface for defining the electronic message handling rule comprises one or more user interface objects for defining one or more conditions for the rule and one or more user interface objects for defining one or more actions to be performed if the one or more conditions are satisfied* (p. 244 [002], p. 247 [007] → Syroid discloses that the message handling system uses conditions and actions to create a rule).

As to claim 3, Syroid teaches wherein *one or more user interface objects for defining one or more conditions for the rule are a subset of all of the possible conditions for the rule* (Fig 6-17 → Syroid discloses in his figure that the conditions are grouped under a larger group of conditions).

As to claim 4, Syroid teaches wherein *the context comprises the context of reading a received electronic message* (p. 246 [005], p.249 [009] → Syroid discloses that the message handling system applies rules to incoming messages for the user to read).

As to claim 5, Syroid teaches wherein *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of a sender of the received electronic mail message* (p. 250 [013], p. 252 [018] → Syroid discloses that one of the

conditions of setting a flag can be applied to a message sent from a specified individual).

As to claim 6, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the received electronic mail message* (p. 250 [014], p. 252 [020] [022] → Syroid discloses that a condition could be based on content of a received message).

As to claim 7, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of one or more intended recipients of the electronic mail message* (p. 250 [015], p.252 [019] → Syroid discloses that conditions could be set for messages that are sent to specified individuals).

As to claim 8, Syroid teaches *wherein the context comprises the context of creating an electronic mail message* (p. 252 [021] → Syroid discloses that messages sent which are created may set conditions based on specified words in the body of a message).

As to claim 9, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a*

*condition for the rule based on the identity of the intended recipient of the created electronic mail message (p. 250 [015] → Syroid discloses that conditions could be set for messages that are sent to specified individuals).*

As to claim 10, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the created electronic mail message (p. 252 [020] → Syroid discloses that messages sent which are created may set conditions based on specified words in the subject of a message).*

As to claim 11, Syroid teaches *the context comprises the context of creating an alert subscription (p. 249 [011] → Syroid discloses wherein a condition could be set to notify when an important message arrives).*

As to claim 12, Syroid teaches wherein *the one or more conditions for the rule comprise receiving an alert electronic mail message generated as a result of the alert subscription (p. 249 [011] → Syroid discloses that a user-specified notification message is displayed in reference to an important message alert).*

As to claim 13, Syroid teaches *wherein the context comprises the context of selecting a name (p. 248 [008], p. 250 [013] → Syroid discloses selecting a name from the Rule Address subdialog).*

As to claim 14, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface object for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the selected name* (p. 250 [013] [015] → Syroid discloses that conditions could be set for messages that are sent to specified individuals).

As to claim 15, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of a received electronic mail message* (p. 252 [020] → Syroid discloses that a condition could be based on content of a received message).

As to claim 16, Syroid teaches *a computer-readable medium comprising computer-readable instructions which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform the electronic message handling rule of claim 1* (p.15 [001] → Syroid discloses that a CD could be used to install the software of Outlook onto a computer's hard drive).

As to claim 17, it's inherent to one skilled in the art that a computer-controlled apparatus capable of performing the method of claim 1 is present and needed to perform the functions of the software system.

As to claim 18, Syroid teaches a *contextually sensitive user interface for defining an electronic message handling rule* (p. 245 [003], p. 246 Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses rules for automated message handling in an email system), *the user interface comprising, one or more user interface objects for specifying one or more conditions for the rule, the one or more user interface objects selected at least in part based upon a context in which a request to create the electronic message handling rule was received* (p. 246 [004], Fig 6-14 → Syroid discloses selection the Rule Wizard command from a user to create a condition for a incoming or outgoing message); *and one or more user interface objects for defining one or more actions to be performed if the one or more specified conditions are satisfied* (p. 244 [002], p. 247 [007] → Syroid discloses that the message handling system uses conditions and actions to create a rule).

As to claim 19, Syroid teaches *wherein the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of a sender of the received electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of reading a received electronic mail message* (p. 246 [005], p. 249 [010] [012] → Syroid discloses that conditions and actions can be set for incoming messages to read based on content of the message and the identity of the sender).

As to claim 20, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the received electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of reading a received electronic mail message* (p. 250 [014], p. 252 [020] → Syroid discloses that conditions and actions can be set for incoming messages to read based on content of the message).

As to claim 21, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of one or more intended recipient of the electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of reading a received electronic mail message* (p. 252 [019] → Syroid discloses that conditions and actions can be set for outgoing messages based on the intended receiver).

As to claim 22, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the identity of the intended recipient of the created electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of creating a electronic mail message* (p. 252 [019] → Syroid discloses that conditions can be set for messages created and being sent to an individual).

As to claim 23, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of the created electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of creating an electronic mail message* (p. 249 [009], p. 252 [020] → Syroid discloses the conditions could be set for messages that the user creates based on the content of the message).

As to claim 24, Syroid teaches *the one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on the selected name when the context comprises the context of selecting a name* (p. 248 [008], p. 250 [013] → Syroid discloses that names can be selected from a database, with the selected names conditions can be set for that individual person or persons).

As to claim 25, Syroid *one or more user interface objects for defining the one or more conditions for the rule comprise a user interface object for setting a condition for the rule based on a subject of a received electronic mail message when the context comprises the context of selecting a name* (p. 248 [008], p. 249 [010], p.252 [020] → Syroid discloses conditions can be based on incoming messages with specified content and from a specified person).

As to claim 26, Syroid teaches a *computer-readable medium comprising computer-readable instructions which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform the electronic message handling rule of claim 18* (p.15 [001] → Syroid discloses that a CD could be used to install the Outlook software onto a computer. The CD is the computer readable medium).

As to claim 27, it's inherent to one skilled in the art that *a computer-controlled apparatus capable of performing the method of claim 18* is present and needed to perform the functions of the software system.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Leeds (Publication No 2002/0016824 A1) and Nielsen (US Patent No 6453327 B1) both disclose system and methods of filtering email messages also known as junk mail with user specified commands which include conditions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea N. Long  
09/21/2006

  
Heather R. Herndon  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100